

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

The rectangular box identified as 68 in Figure 2 and the rectangular boxes identified as elements 6, 7, 51, and 68 in Figure 6 have been labeled.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

The present communication is responsive to the Office Action mailed March 28, 2008. A Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time extending the time for responding to the Office Action from June 28, 2008 up to and including July 28, 2008 is submitted herewith.

Claims 1-44 were originally presented in the present Application. Claims 1-44 have been rejected. Claims 1-13, and 15-44 have been amended herein. Claim 14 has been cancelled and no claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-13 and 15-44 are pending in the present Application. All amendments to the claims are supported by the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Applicant sets forth remarks relating to the action below.

The Examiner objected to the abstract because of what he considers to be the inclusion of legal phraseology. Applicants have set forth amendments to the originally filed abstract in the present amendment. Any amendments made to the abstract should not be considered admissions regarding whether the Applicant agrees or disagrees with the Examiner's assertion regarding legal phraseology. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the abstract.

The Examiner noted that in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted September 23, 2005 no copy of German Patent DE 19715702 was presented therewith. The Applicant has submitted a copy of this reference herein and requests that the Examiner considers the reference and makes it of record.

The Examiner objected to the drawings asserting that in Figure 2 the rectangular box identified as 68 and in figure 6 the rectangular boxes identified as elements 6, 7, 51, and 68 each require labeling. In response, the Applicant has submitted corrected drawing sheets herewith in compliance with 37 CFR

1.121(d). Each drawing sheet submitted has been labeled in the top margin as a "Replacement Sheet". Applicant submits that the corrected drawings contain no new matter and should be accepted by the Examiner.

Moving to substantive rejections, the Examiner rejected claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner rejected claim 1 as unclear regarding how much weight should be given to the parenthetical expression such as "in particular in an XY plane". In response, the Applicant has deleted this recitation in claim 1. With respect to claim 27 the Examiner asserted that the language "for example" on line 4 of the claim renders the claim indefinite. The Applicant has deleted this recitation from claim 27 herein. The Applicant also notes that the claims have been amended in order to conform to standard U.S. practice and respectfully request that the § 112, second paragraph rejection of the claims should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, and 15-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,003,153 to Kondo ("*Kondo*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,460,757 to Hedgecoth ("*Hedgecoth*") and U.S. Patent No. 5,601,644 to Yasoschima ("*Yasoschima*") and U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0266239 to Yip ("*Yip*"), and claims 4-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kondo* in view of *Hedgecoth*, *Yasoschima* and *Yip* as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Japanese Patent No. 9-300972 Tanigawa ("*Tanigawa*"). Further, the Examiner has indicated allowable subject matter in the present Action. In particular, the Examiner notes that claims 14 and 26-44 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112,

second paragraph set forth in the Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. In response, independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 14 therein. As by the Examiner's own admission, amended independent claim 1 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 2-13 and 15-44 should also be in condition for allowance, *inter alia*, by virtue of their dependence from amended claim 1. A dependent claim is necessarily narrower than an independent claim from which it properly depends.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 25, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

William A. Di Bianca

Registration No.: 58,653

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant